



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/541,897	07/07/2005	Jeong-Hwan Lee	ABS-2000 US	6239
32605 7590 12/07/2007 MACPHERSON KWOK CHEN & HEID LLP 2033 GATEWAY PLACE SUITE 400 SAN JOSE, CA 95110			EXAMINER NGUYEN, LAUREN	
			ART UNIT 2871	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 12/07/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/541,897	Applicant(s) LEE ET AL.	
	Examiner Lauren Nguyen	Art Unit 2871	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 November 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-6 and 8-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1,3-6, 8-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Receipt is acknowledged of applicant's amendment filed on 11/13/2007.

Claims 2, 7, and 11 were canceled. Thus, claims 1, 3-6, 8-9 and 10 are pending for examination.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/13/2007 has been entered.

Specification

2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 11/13/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

4. The applicant argues (see page 11) regarding the amended **claims 2-3 and 7** that "*Sakuramoto et al. does not disclose laminating a light condensing with a light controlling part.*" This is irrelevant and not persuasive. The examiner merely relies on **Sakuramoto et al.** for the teaching of an adhesive layer being disposed between the two layers to prevent the films from shifting and foreign substances from coming into each interface (see Office Action, page 4). In addition, **Sakuramoto et al.** also states the layers can be a prism sheet and a diffuser plate (see at

least column 9). The claim language therefore does not patentably distinguish over the applied reference[s], and the previous rejections are maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 1, 3-4, 6** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over **Kashima (US 6,104,455)** in view of **Sakuramoto et al. (US 6,369,945)**.

7. With respect to **claim 1, Kashima** (figure 18) discloses a backlight assembly (figure 18) comprising: a light generating part (3); a light controlling part (5) that controls the light generated from the light generating part; and a light condensing part (6) disposed on the light controlling part so as to condense the controlled light:

Kashima does not disclose an adhesive layer disposed between the light controlling part and the light condensing part. However, **Sakuramoto et al.**, in at least column 7, lines 32-34, column 8, lines 29-36, and column 9, lines 26-31, figure 3, discloses an adhesive layer (2) disposed between the light controlling part (1) and the light condensing part (3) so as to laminate the light condensing part with the light controlling part. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the layers of **Kashima** with the adhesive layer of **Sakuramoto et al.** because such modification would prevent the films from shifting and foreign substances from coming into each interface (see at least column 7; lines 55-60).

8. With respect to **claim 3**, **Sakuramoto et al.** discloses the adhesive layer comprises an acryl resin (see at least column 10, lines 45-48).

9. With respect to **claim 4**, **Kashima** (figure 18) discloses the light controlling part comprises a light diffusion plate diffusing the light (5), and the light condensing part comprises a brightness enhancement sheet that condenses the light (6).

10. With respect to **claim 6**, **Kashima** (figure 18) discloses an LCD apparatus (figure 18) comprising: an LCD panel including an upper substrate, a lower substrate, a liquid crystal layer interposed between the upper and lower substrate (7); and a backlight assembly including a lamp (3) that generates a light for the LCD panel, a light controlling part (5) that controls the light generated from the lamp, and a light condensing part (6) integrally formed on the light controlling part so as to condense the light.

Kashima does not disclose an adhesive layer disposed between the light controlling part and the light condensing part. However, **Sakuramoto et al.**, in at least column 7, lines 32-34, column 8, lines 29-36, and column 9, lines 26-31, figure 3, discloses an adhesive layer (2) disposed between the light controlling part (1) and the light condensing part (3) so as to laminate the light condensing part with the light controlling part. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the layers of **Kashima** with the adhesive layer of **Sakuramoto et al.** because such modification would prevent the films from shifting and foreign substances from coming into each interface (see at least column 7, lines 55-60).

11. **Claim 5** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Kashima** in view of **Sakuramoto et al.**, further in view of **Oda et al. (U.S. Publication Number 2003/0063234)**.

12. With respect to **claim 5**, **Kashima** in view of **Sakuramoto et al.** discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of **claim 4** above. **Kashima** in view of **Sakuramoto et al.** does not disclose the limitation of **claim 5**. However, **Oda et al.**, in at least paragraph 0043, lines 3-6, figure 2, discloses the brightness enhancement sheet comprises a prism shape including a rounded ridge. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the prism of **Kashima** in view of **Sakuramoto et al.** with the teaching of **Oda et al.** because such modification would eliminate the occurrence of a brighter area at the center of the light exit surface and thus, achieve a high-quality backlight without uneven luminance distribution (see at least paragraph 0043, lines 12-15).

13. **Claim 8** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Kashima** in view of **Sakuramoto et al.**, further in view of **Kuroiwa et al.** (US 2001/0035928).

14. With respect to **claim 8**, **Kashima** in view of **Sakuramoto et al.** (figure 18) discloses a polarizer (9B) disposed under the lower substrate (7) to transmit a portion of the light generated from the backlight assembly. **Kashima** in view of **Sakuramoto et al.** does not disclose a reflective polarizing film. However, **Kuroiwa** (in at least paragraph 0008; figures 1-3) discloses a reflective polarizing film (160) integrally formed under the polarizer (140) to transmit a portion of the light and to reflect a remaining portion of the light. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the liquid crystal display of **Kashima** in view of **Sakuramoto et al.** with the reflective polarizer of **Kuroiwa et al.** because such modification would effectively prevent the reversion of the same bright/dark states between the reflective display mode and the transmissive display mode.

15. **Claims 9 and 10** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Kashima** in view of **Sakuramoto et al.**, further in view of **Ohkawa (US 6,339,458)** and **Kuroiwa et al.**

16. With respect to **claim 9**, **Kashima** (figure 18) discloses an LCD apparatus (figure 18) comprising: an LCD panel including an upper polarizer (9A) having a first polarizing axis, an upper substrate disposed under the upper polarizer, a lower substrate, a liquid crystal layer interposed between the upper and lower substrate (7), a lower polarizer (9B) disposed under the lower substrate (5) to have a second polarizing axis; and a backlight assembly including a lamp (3) that generates a light for the LCD panel, a light diffusing plate (5) diffusing the light generated from the lamp, and a brightness enhancement sheet (6) integrally formed with the light diffusion plate so as to condense the diffused light, and a reflecting plate (8) disposed under the lamp so as to reflect the light generated from the lamp into the light diffusion plate.

Kashima does not disclose the remaining limitations of **claim 9**. **Sakuramoto et al.**, in at least column 7, lines 32-34, column 8, lines 29-36, and column 9, lines 26-31, figure 3, discloses an adhesive layer (2) disposed between the light controlling part (1) and the light condensing part (3) so as to laminate the light condensing part with the light controlling part. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the layers of **Kashima** with the adhesive layer of **Sakuramoto et al.** because such modification would prevent the films from shifting and foreign substances from coming into each interface (see at least column 7, lines 55-60).

Ohkawa in at least column 4, line 53-55, figures 1 and 2, discloses a protection sheet disposed on the brightness enhancement sheet (5) so as to prevent the breakage of the LCD panel. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify

the LCD device of **Kashima** in view of **Sakuramoto et al.** with the protection sheet of **Ohkawa** because such modification would prevent the prism sheet from being damage and make the reflective appearance of edges or the like less conspicuous (see at least column 4, lines 55-59).

Kuroiwa (in at least paragraph 0008; figures 1-3) discloses a second polarizing axis that is substantially perpendicular to the first polarizing axis (120T and 140T, figure 3) and a reflective polarizing film (160) integrally formed under the polarizer (140). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the liquid crystal display of **Kashima** in view of **Sakuramoto et al.** and **Ohkawa** with the reflective polarizer of **Kuroiwa et al.** because such modification would effectively prevent the reversion of the same bright/dark states between the reflective display mode and the transmissive display mode.

17. With respect to **claim 10**, **Kuroiwa et al.** (figures 1-3) discloses a second adhesive layer disposed between the reflecting polarizing film (160) and the lower polarizer (140) so as to laminate the reflecting polarizing film with the lower polarizer (see at least paragraph 0042, lines 8-11).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lauren Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 270-1428. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 7:30-5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Nelms can be reached on (571) 272-1787. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.


Application/Control Number:
10/541,897
Art Unit: 2871

Page 8

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Lauren Nguyen

November 26, 2007


ANDREW SCHECHTER
PRIMARY EXAMINER